UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,978	05/25/2001	Masood Mortazavi	SUN1P820/P5884	6345

22434	7590	04/14/2004

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP
P.O. BOX 778
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778

EXAMINER
MOSLEHI, FARHOOD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	7

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _18 February 2004_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-44_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-44_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _5_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

1.   Claims 1-44 are presented for examination.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3.   Claims 1,3-8,10,12-16,18-23,25,27-31,33-38,40-44 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by iPlanet Application Server 6.0 White Paper,

Technical Reference Guide, Sun Microsystems, May 25,2000 (hereinafter Sun).

4.   As per claim 1, Sun teaches a computer-implemented method for a first

component to invoke a second component asynchronously in an object-oriented

computing environment, the computer-implemented method comprising: receiving a

request from a first component to invoke a second component (e.g. page 23, iPlanet

Application Server diagram); maintaining the scope of the received request (page 23,

lines 1-5); providing a thread for identifying the received request and invoking the

second component, wherein the thread identifies an exception listener for handling

exceptions associated with the invocation of the second component (page 26, lines 1-

15).

5.   As per claim 10, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

6.   As per claim 16, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

7.   As per claim 25, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

8.   As per claim 31, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

9.   As per claim 38, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

10.   As per claim 43, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

11.   As per claim 44, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

12.   As per claim 3, Sun shows a computer-implemented method wherein the request

is associated with no application specific exceptions (e.g. page 91, "Enterprise

Connectors").

13.   As per claim 12, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

14.   As per claim 18, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

15.   As per claim 27, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

16.   As per claim 33, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

17.   As per claim 40, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

18.   As per claim 4, Sun shows the computer-implemented method wherein the first

and second components are associated with separate servers (e.g. page 9, "improved

Performance, Scalability and Reliability").

19.   As per claim 13, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

20.   As per claim 19, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

21.   As per claim 28, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

22.   As per claim 34, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

23.   As per claim 41, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

24.   As per claim 5, Sun teaches the computer-method wherein the first and second

components are Enterprise Java Bean components (e.g. page 12, "Application Model").

The Application components are clearly marked as Enterprise JavaBeans.

25.   As per claim 14, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

26.   As per claim 20, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

27.   As per claim 29, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

28.   As per claim 35, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

29.   As per claim 42, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

30.   As per claim 6, Sun, demonstrates the computer-implemented method, wherein

the first and second components are associated with a container (e.g. page 28,

"Services Hosted by KJS Only", EJB container).

31.   As per claim 15, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

32.   As per claim 21, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

33.   As per claim 30, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

34.   As per claim 36, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

35.   As per claim 7, Sun clearly shows the computer-implemented method, further

comprising placing the request from the first component is placed in a queue (e.g. page

26, lines 1-11).

36.   As per claim 22, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

37.   As per claim 8, Sun clearly shows the computer-implemented method, wherein

the worker thread dequeues the received request after receiving a transaction commit

signal from the container (e.g. page 44, "How the Servlet Engine Allocates Resources").

38.   As per claim 23, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

39.   As per claim 37, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

40.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

41.   Claims 2,11,17,26,32,39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun in view of Katrina E. Kerry Falkner et al., Implementing Asynchronous Remote Method Invocation in Java, July 2, 1999 (hereinafter Falkner).

42.   As per claim 2, Sun does not specifically show a computer-implemented method wherein the request has a return type of void. Falkner clearly shows computer-implemented method wherein the request has a return type of void (e.g. page 4, "package ServerTests", Asynch1 method). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Sun with Falkner. The motivation would have been to invoke a component without returning any value; hence using a void return type.

43.   As per claim 17, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

44.   As per claim 32, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

45.   As per claim 39, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

46.   As per claim 11, Sun does not specifically show a computer-implemented method wherein the asynchronous proxy has the same type as the second component. Falkner clearly shows a computer-implemented method wherein the asynchronous proxy has the same type as the second component (e.g. page 4, "package ServerTests", Asynch1 method). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Sun with Falkner. The motivation would have been to invoke a component asynchronously without returning any value; hence using a void return type.

47.   As per claim 26, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

48.   Claims 9 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun in view of Falkner as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Sun Microsystems, Java Message Service, November 9, 1999 (hereinafter Sun Microsystems).

49.   As per claim 9, Sun even when combined with Falkner do not specifically show the computer-implemented method wherein the exception listener receives the exception and the scope of the exception. Sun Microsystems clearly teaches the computer-implemented method wherein the exception listener receives the exception and the scope of the exception (e.g. page 54, "ExceptionListener"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Sun, Falkner and Sun Microsystems. The motivation would have been to set up a listener that acts as a trap server to receive all exceptions from components that are sending exception messages.

50.   As per claim 24, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

51.   Applicant's arguments filed 2/18/2004 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

52.   In the remarks, applicants argued in substance that (1) Sun does not describe any identifier for an invoked component, a scope of an invoked component, or any invoked component for that matter.

53.   As to point (1) the examiner disagrees because the KXS process first has to identify the processes that arrive in order to forward them to the correct Server process. An identifier has to be attached to each process in order for the KXS to be able to identify the process as Java or C++. Furthermore the scope of the process is identified by the number of threads that are established for each process within its memory space.

54.   In the remarks, applicants in substance argue that (2) Sun does not teach or suggest identifying an exception listener for handling exceptions to allow asynchronous invocation.

55.   As to point (2) the examiner disagrees because assignment of various threads by the Request management system is done by listeners. Moreover, the application Server uses Listeners to handle new requests coming from the web server (e.g. page 25, lines 4-8).

56.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Farhood Moslehi whose telephone number is 703-305-

8646. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

fm

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100